



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/792,255

03/02/2004

Trent M. Thomas

114048-23

3967

27189

7590

02/05/2009

PROCOPIO, CORY, HARGREAVES & SAVITCH LLP

530 B STREET

SUITE 2100

SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

EXAMINER

WEI, ZHENG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2192

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/05/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@procopio.com

PTONotifications@procopio.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/792,255	Applicant(s) THOMAS ET AL.	
	Examiner ZHENG WEI	Art Unit 2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19,21-30,40 and 41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19,21-30,40 and 41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 10/27/2008.
2. Claim 19 has been amended.
3. Claims 19, 21-30, 40 and 41 remain pending and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/27/2008, in particular on pages 7-8, have been fully considered:
 - At page 7, first paragraph, the Applicants submit that the autostart driver of the host device is primarily responsible for initiating the execution of the application start-up instructions and that is not the same issue addressed by the claims. First of all, it is noted that the Examiner is not able to find exact paragraphs as the Applicants cited in Redford reference e.g. paragraph 55-60. The Examiner assumes the information the Applicants cited is at col.7-col.8 of Redford. Secondly, as Redford disclosed at col.7, lines 54-61, the start-up instructions could be "start an application" or "execute certain application instructions" (see for example, col.7, lines 54-62). Therefore, DISCO.BAT provides command (start an application) to invoke/execute/launch application (software program) which is the same as recited in the amended claims.
 - At page 7, last two lines, the Applicants point out that unlike the autostart driver of Redford that initiates the execution of the application start-up

Art Unit: 2192

instructions, the task disk control file executes and launches the selected one of the plurality of software program according to the amended claim. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, the start-up instruction is the command to execute and launch which start an application. It is well known in the computer art that in order to execute and/or launch a software program, the program name has to be invoked or called. Therefore using the startup instruction to start an application is the same as providing the command to execute or launch the program as recited in the claims (see for example, col.7, lines 54-62).

- At page 8, second paragraph, the Applicants submit that Redford fails to describe “executing the selected one of the plurality of software programs by the task disk control file configured to provide commands to execute the selected one of the plurality of software programs” and “provide commas to execute the selected one of the plurality of software program” and “launching the selected one of the plurality of software program...is configured to provide commands to launch the selected one of the plurality of software programs”. First of all, it should be noted that claim language “is configured to provide command” [emphasis added] to execute/launch the software programs can be reasonably interpreted as any steps or configurations that is able to use to provide command including to provide command (instruction) as in DISGO.BAT to start/execute application (see for example, col.7, lines 54-62)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 19, 21-30, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Redford (Redford et al., US 5,711,672) in view of Owens (Owens et al., US 5,555,416)

Claim 19:

Redford discloses a method of managing a plurality of user-selectable software programs for use with a computer device in accordance with a task disk control file contained on storage media external to or removable from the computer device, said method comprising:

- Detecting an insertion of the storage media into the computer device (see for example, Fig.1D, step 113 and 115 and related text)
- activating the storage media to establish communication with the computer device (see for example, Fig.1D, step 113, 115, "interrupts" and related text);
- providing from the task disk control file a list of the plurality of software programs located on the storage media (see for example, col.7, lines 43-45, "a file with second predetermined name (such as DISGO.BAT) must be present on the storage media")

Art Unit: 2192

- selecting one of the plurality of software programs for execution, wherein a user performs said selecting (see for example, col.7, lines 49-62; also see col.11, lines 30-32 and related text)
- providing special instructions in a plurality of task disk control sub-files corresponding to the plurality of software programs, wherein the plurality of task disk control sub-files is located on the storage media, and the special instructions in each task disk control sub-file include configuration information, software launching information, and data file storage information (see for example, Fig.1D, step 117, "Is DSIGOKEY.exe present in removable storage media peripheral which caused interrupt?"). But does not explicitly disclose including clean-up information. However, Redford also discloses Fig.3B1 and Fig.3B2 which have unload and/or optionally restore steps. Therefore, it has to have the clean-up information involved to direct the autostart driver to perform these steps.
- transferring files specified in the configuration information and configuring the computer device in accordance with the configuration information, wherein said transferring and said configuring changes the computer device from a first state to a second state execution (see for example, Fig.3B1 steps 351, 353 and related text);
- executing the selected one of the plurality of software programs by the task disk control file configured to provide commands to execute the selected one of the plurality of software programs (see for example, col.7, lines 54-62,

Art Unit: 2192

- “(1)start an application either from the inserted storage media or alternatively from a permanently installed storage media...(4) execute certain application...”)
- launching the selected one of the plurality of software programs in accordance with the software launching information on the task disk control file wherein the task disk control file is configured to provide commands to launch the selected one of the plurality of software programs (see for example, Fig.1D, step 129, “Execute X:\DISGO.bat” and related text; also see col.7, lines 54-62, “(1) start an application...(3)display certain selections...(4)execute certain application instructions);
 - monitoring events to determine various stages in the operation of the selected one of the plurality of software programs(see for example, Fig.3B1, step 339, “Check if status of current peripheral has changed?” and related text; also see steps 378-385 about removing current peripheral); and
 - unconfiguring the computer device upon termination of the selected one of the plurality of software program by removing files transferred to the computing device and configuration settings in accordance with the clean-up information to essentially return the computer device to the first state (see for example, Fig.3B1, steps 378-385 about removing current peripheral)

But does not explicitly disclose determining that the control file indicates the presence of the plurality of software programs located on the storage media.

However, Owens in the same analogous art of automated software installation

Art Unit: 2192

and operating environment configuration, discloses the same feature about determining the installation programs/files on the storage media (pre-install class, an install class or a post-install class) according to the control file (rules file) (see for example, Fig.2, items 30', 36', 38' and related text; also see Fig.5, steps 68, 70, 72, 74 and 76 and related text). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to verify the execution condition including the presence of installation files on the storage media in order to pick different execution paths according to the presence of the installation files. One would have been motivated to do so to select the correct solution by determining or verifying all the installation files (see for example, Fig.5, steps 68, 70, 72, 74 and 76 and related text)

Claim 21:

Redford further discloses the method of claim 20, wherein the list of software programs only includes the programs having a corresponding control file information (see for example, Fig.1D, step 129, "Execute X:\DISGO.bat" and related text).

Claim 22:

Redford also discloses the method of claim 19, further comprising copying one or more files to said computer device to create said second state, wherein the files include one or more of the following: linked library files, device drivers, path

Art Unit: 2192

information, environmental information, and registry entries (see for example, Fig.3B1, steps 345-353 about reading an identifier, flagging current peripheral and loading application to memory and relate text).

Claim 23:

Redford further discloses the method of claim 22, wherein said unconfiguring step comprises removing all files copied to create said second state (see for example, Fig.3B1, steps 378-385 about unloading and restoring computer device and related text).

Claim 24:

Redford also discloses the method of claim 19, further comprising: selecting a plurality of software programs for execution; configuring the computer device for each of the plurality of software programs selected by copying one or more files to said computer device, wherein the files include one or more of the following: linked library files, device drivers, path information, environmental information, and registry entries information (see for example, Fig.1D, step 129, "Execute X:\DISGO.bat" and related text about DSIGO.bat file).

Claim 25:

Redford also discloses the method of claim 24, further comprising unconfiguring the computer device upon termination of each of the executed software programs

Art Unit: 2192

by removing any files copied during configuration and any new files created during execution of each terminated software program (see for example, Fig.3B1, steps 378-385 about unloading and restoring computer device and related text).

Claim 28:

Redford also discloses the method of claim 19, wherein the storage media comprises an optical drive (see for example, Fig.3A, element 220, "CD ROM DRIVE").

Claim 29:

Redford also discloses the method of claim 19, wherein the storage media comprises a removable magnetic media drive (see for example, Fig.3A, element 213, "FLOPPY DISK DRIVE").

Claims 26 and 27

Redford and Owens disclose the computer-readable media of claim 19 above, but does not explicitly disclose wherein the computer-readable medium comprises a CompactFlash/flash memory drive. However, it is well known in the computer art that CompactFlash(CF) is a type of data storage device used in portable electronic devices by using flash memory in a standardized enclosure. It is first specified and produced by ScanDisk in 1994 and had been widely used for a variety of devices when this invention was made. Therefore, it would have been

Art Unit: 2192

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use CompactFlash/flash memory drive as a portable data storage media to save software, data and instruction file as Redford disclosed.

Claim 30

Redford and Owens discloses the computer-readable medium of claims 19 above, but does not explicitly disclose wherein the computer-readable medium comprises an external hard disk drive. However, it is well known in the computer art that external hard disk drive as a portal data storage media can be used to save/store computer readable data information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use external hard disk drive to store the instructions as Redford disclosed for automatically starting execution and ending execution of process from a removable storage media.

Claims 40 and 41:

Redford and Owens disclose the method of claim 19, but do not explicitly disclose wherein said selecting is performed by the user using a text-based or graphical user interface menu. However, Redford also discloses the features "wait for button code", "First Button Pressed?", "Display First Selection" Which implies that there is a user interface for receiving user inputs (see for example, Fig.3D and related text). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having

Art Unit: 2192

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement said user interface using text-based or graphical options.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the additional information as presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zheng Wei whose telephone number is (571)

Art Unit: 2192

270-1059 and Fax number is (571) 270-2059. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:00-15:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is 571- 272-1000.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Z. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 2192

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193